UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,011	07/06/2006	Roberto Squillario	5855	4712

26936 7590 03/20/2009
SHOEMAKER AND MATTARE, LTD
10 POST OFFICE ROAD - SUITE 100
SILVER SPRING, MD 20910

EXAMINER	
MORTELL, JOHN F	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,011	SQUILLARIO, ROBERTO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN F. MORTELL	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 January 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *25,27-33,35-38 and 40-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *25,27-33,35-38 and 40-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 January 2009* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. Claims 25, 27-33, 35-38, and 40-52 are pending in the application. The applicant had previously cancelled claims 1-24. With this amendment, the applicant has also canceled claims 26, 34, and 39. The applicant has added claims 49-52.

The applicants having amended the drawings and the disclosure, the objections to the drawings are withdrawn.

The applicants having cancelled claim 26, the objection to, and rejection of, claim 26 are moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Summers (US 3,651,512).

Regarding claim 46, Summers discloses:

> warning kit (col. 1, lines 56-61) comprising
>
> a warning device suitable for warning an operator of a patient's request (col. 1, lines 56-61; Summers discloses a communication apparatus for an individual who is sick, weak, or unable to speak, which suggests a patient in communication with a caregiver), said device comprising

handling means, adapted for being handled by the patient for sending a request signal (col. 2. lines 56-61, 70-72; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 2: 13);

reception means, in operating connection with said handling means, adapted for receiving said request signal (col. 2, lines 59-61; col. 4, line 49 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 11);

interpreting means, in operating connection with said reception means, adapted for emitting a signal that can be interpreted by the operator (col. 2, lines 61-64; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 12);

protection means adapted for covering said handling means (col. 7, lines 12-14, 19-21; Fig. 5: 124, 127).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35-38, 40, 44, 45, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Glen et al. (US 4,810, 996).

Regarding claim 25, Summers discloses:

warning device being adapted to warn an operator of a patient's request (col. 1, lines 56-61; Summers discloses a communication apparatus for an individual who is sick, weak, or unable to speak, which suggests a patient in communication with a caregiver), said device comprising

> handling means, adapted for being handled by the patient for sending a request signal (col. 2, lines 56-61, 70-72; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 2: 13);
>
> reception means, in operating connection with said handling means, adapted for receiving said request signal (col. 2, lines 59-61; col. 4, line 49 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 11); and
>
> interpreting means, in operating connection with said reception means, adapted for emitting a signal that can be interpreted by the operator (col. 2, lines 61-64; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 12); and
>
> means for displaying said request to the patient before emitting it (col. 2, lines 56-67: FIG. 1: 12, 15, 19).

Summers does not disclose a warning device for a dental seat.

Glen, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein a holster secures the device to a dental chair for the benefit of placing the device within easy reach of the dental patient. (col. 1, lines 62-63; col. 3, lines 9-16, 36-43)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein a holster secures the device to a dental chair, as taught by Glen, with the device disclosed by Summers because it would place the device within easy reach of the dental patient.

Regarding claim 27, Summers further discloses a device wherein said interpreting means comprise a display having at least one portion that can be pointed

out following the reception, by said interpretation means, of said request signal. (col. 2, lines 61-69; col. 3, lines 48-53; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 12, 15)

Regarding claim 28, Summers further discloses a device wherein said display has a plurality of said portions, each portion being distinguishable from the other. (col. 2, lines 61-69; col. 3, lines 32-46; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 15, 16, 17, 18, 19)

Regarding claim 30, Summers further discloses a device wherein each of said portions is distinguishable from the other by a different position on said display. (See the citations for claim 28.)

Regarding claim 31, Summers further discloses a device wherein said portion exhibits a representation of said patient's request. (col. 2, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 34-46; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7)

Regarding claim 32, Summers further discloses a device wherein said portion is illuminable. (See the citations for claim 28.)

Regarding claim 33, Summers further discloses a device wherein said interpreting means comprise sound emission means adapted for emitting a sound signal based on said request signal. (col. 10, lines 38-41: claim 13)

Regarding claim 37, Summers further discloses a device wherein said at least one selection switch exhibits a representation of the patient's request. (col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7)

Regarding claim 38, Summers further discloses a device further comprising means for controlling said interpreting means. (col. 2. lines 56-61, 70-72; col. 6, line 73

– col. 7, line 7; FIG. 2: 13)

Regarding claim 40, Summers does not disclose a device wherein said controlling means comprise language setting means.

Glen, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein the device includes a language choice switch for the benefit of providing feedback to the treating person where the patient cannot readily speak or verbally communicate. (col. 1, lines 62-63; col. 2, lines 3-4, 62-68; col. 3, lines 9-11, 36-43; col. 4, lines 15-19; FIG. 2: 35)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein the device includes a language choice switch, as taught by Glen, with the device disclosed by Summers because it would enable the device to provide feedback to the treating person where the patient cannot readily speak or verbally communicate.

Regarding claim 44, Summers further discloses a device further comprising means for supporting the interpreting means, adapted for placing said interpreting mans in a position suitable for the patient's view. (col. 2, lines 56-61; FIG. 1: 11, 12; Summers teaches the housing of a display panel in a generally rectangular box configured to stand upright on a generally planar surface, thereby presenting the display panel in a generally upright orientation to a viewer.)

Regarding claim 45, Summers discloses:

a warning device suitable for warning an operator of a patient's request (col. 1, lines 56-61; Summers teaches a communication apparatus for an individual who is sick, weak, or unable to speak, which suggests a patient in communication with a caregiver), said device comprising

handling means, adapted for being handled by the patient for sending a request signal (col. 2, lines 56-61, 70-72; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 2: 13);

reception means, in operating connection with said handling means, adapted for receiving said request signal (col. 2, lines 59-61; col. 4, line 49 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 11);

interpreting means, in operating connection with said reception means, adapted for emitting a signal that can be interpreted by the operator (col. 2, lines 61-64; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 1: 12).

Summers does not disclose a dental seat associated to a warning device.

Glen, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein a holster may secure the device may to a dental chair for the benefit of placing the device within easy reach of the dental patient. (col. 1, lines 62-63; col. 3, lines 9-16, 36-43)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein a holster may secure the device may to a dental chair, as taught by Glen, with the device taught by Summers because it would place the device within easy reach of the dental patient.

Regarding claim 49, Summers discloses handling means comprising at least one

selection switch for selecting the request to be made (col. 2, line 70 – col. 3, line 16; col. 6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7; FIG. 2: 13, 28, 20, 31, 32) but does not disclose a confirmation switch for activating sound emission means.

Glen, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein a holster secures the device to a dental chair for the benefit of placing the device within easy reach of the dental patient. (col. 1, lines 62-63; col. 3, lines 9-16, 36-43)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the dental patient communication device comprising a hand-held housing with a button by which a dental patient can trigger an audible alarm, wherein a holster secures the device to a dental chair, as taught by Glen, with the device disclosed by Summers because it would place the device within easy reach of the dental patient.

Regarding claim 35 (depends from claim 49), Summers further teaches a device comprising a warning box containing at least one selection switch. (col. 2. lines 56-61, 70-72; col. 2, lines 72 – col. 3, line 31; FIG. 2: 13, 28, 30, 31, 32)

Regarding claim 36 (depends from claim 35), Summers further discloses a device wherein said warning box is adapted for being gripped by the patient. (col. 2, lines 70-72)

Regarding claim 50, Summers further discloses a device wherein the signal corresponding to the patient's request is activated when the selection switch is kept

pressed for a predetermined time. (6, line 73 – col. 7, line 7)

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Glen and further in view of Brown (US 5,040,988)

Regarding claim 29, the above combination of Summers and Glen does not disclose a device wherein each of said portions is distinguishable from the other by a different color.

Brown, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a visual aid device that permits individuals to communicate their feelings and emotions without talking, comprising a display having a plurality of portions, each of which is distinguishable by a different color for the benefit of providing communication without requiring any verbal exchanges. (col. 3, lines 28-31; col. 4, lines 8-37; Fig. 2: 14-20, 62, 64, 70, 72)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the visual aid device that permits individuals to communicate their feelings and emotions without talking, comprising a display having a plurality of portions, each of which is distinguishable by a different color, as taught by Brown, with the device taught by the above combination because it would enable the device to provide communication without requiring any verbal exchanges.

7. Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Glen and further in view of Yoshida et al. (US 5,680,158).

Regarding claim 41, the above combination of Summers and Glen does not

teach a device wherein said language setting means comprise a microprocessor.

Yoshida, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a communication apparatus that permits a person having a hearing, a speech, or a muscular function handicap to communicate with another person by means of characters or voice comprising a control device that controls a process through a keyboard of selecting a language for the benefit of enabling character output data to be outputted so as to satisfy the form of a first language or a second language. (col. 1, liens 11-14, 30-33; col. 11, lines 11-14; FIG. 8: 51; FIG. 9: 110)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the communication apparatus that permits a person having a hearing, a speech, or a muscular function handicap to communicate with another person by means of characters or voice comprising a control device that controls a process through a keyboard of selecting a language, as taught by Yoshida, with the device taught by the above combination because it would enable the device to output character output so as to satisfy the form of a first language or a second language.

Regarding claim 42, the above combination of Summers and Glen teaches the device according to claim 40 but does not teach a device wherein said language setting means comprise a voice recording device adapted for recording the operator's voice.

Yoshida, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a communication apparatus that permits a person having a hearing, a speech, or a muscular function handicap to communicate with another person by means of characters or voice comprising a voice device in which voice information can be recorded for the benefit of enabling a voice

output to be made by means for outputting information about the user's intention. (col. 1, lines 11-14; col. 3, lines 1-3; col. 11, lines 20-25; col. 16, line 18 - col. 17, line 30; Fig. 1: 56, 56a, 56b, 56c, 56d; FIG. 8: 56b, 56d)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the communication apparatus that permits a person having a hearing, a speech, or a muscular function handicap to communicate with another person by means of characters or voice comprising a voice device in which voice information can be recorded, as taught by Yoshida, with the device taught by the above combination because it would enable the device to output a voice by means for outputting information about the user's intention.

8. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Glen and further in view of Goldberg (US 6,817,470 B1).

Regarding claim 43, the above combination of Summers and Glen does not disclose a device comprising removable protection means for covering said handling means.

Goldberg, addressing the same problem of how to configure a protective device for a remote control, teaches a disposable, collapsible, removable sleeve holder for remote controls and similar devices for the benefit of protecting the remote control from environmental elements and preventing the user's hands from encountering unsanitary conditions. (col. 2, lines 3-11, 39-43; col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 2; col. 4, lines 51-54, 58-61, 64-67; col. 5, lines 3-6; FIG. 4; FIG. 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disposable, collapsible, removable sleeve holder for remote controls and similar devices, as taught by Goldberg, with the device taught by the above combination because it would enable the device to protect the remote control from environmental elements and prevent the user's hands from encountering unsanitary conditions.

9. Claims 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Kramer (US 5,030,013).

Regarding claim 47, Summers does not disclose a warning kit wherein said protection means comprise a plurality of covers associable to said handling means and removable from them.

Kramer, addressing the same problem of how to configure a protective cover for storage of an object, teaches an improved container for the storage of personal valuables in a water-tight environment, wherein the container includes an input section, a bag, and a pouch-like structure, called a retainer, that holds the curled input section in place for the benefit of maintaining the closure provided by the curled input section, thereby rendering the container waterproof. (col. 4, lines 50053, 62-66; col. 5, lines 27-42; FIG. FIG. 1: 12, 14, 16; FIG. 3: 12, 16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the improved container for the storage of personal valuables in a water-tight environment, wherein the container includes an input section, a bag, and a

pouch-like structure, called a retainer, that holds the curled input section in place, as taught by Kramer, with the warning kit taught by Summers because it would enable the warning kit to maintaining the closure provided by the curled input section, thereby rendering the container waterproof.

Regarding claim 48, Summers does not disclose a warning kit wherein said protection means comprise a plurality of bags adapted for containing said handling means.

Kramer, addressing the same problem of how to configure a protective cover for storage of an object, teaches an improved container for the storage of personal valuables in a water-tight environment, wherein the container includes an input section, a bag, and a pouch-like structure, called a retainer, that holds the curled input section in place for the benefit of maintaining the closure provided by the curled input section, thereby rendering the container waterproof. (col. 4, lines 50053, 62-66; col. 5, lines 27-42; FIG. FIG. 1: 12, 14, 16; FIG. 3: 12, 16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the improved container for the storage of personal valuables in a water-tight environment, wherein the container includes an input section, a bag, and a pouch-like structure, called a retainer, that holds the curled input section in place, as taught by Kramer, with the warning kit disclosed by Summers because it would enable the warning kit to maintaining the closure provided by the curled input section, thereby rendering the container waterproof.

10. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Glen and further in view of Parsons (US PG Pub. 2004/0178312 A1).

Regarding claim 51, Summers does not disclose a device wherein the reception means are connected to the handling means by radio waves carrying the request signal.

Parsons, in the same field of endeavor, teaches an electronic display suspended above a dental chair, comprising a wireless communication device that transmits input instructions for the display of content on the electronic display for the benefit of enabling a dental patient to select the content presented on the display. ([0008], [0019], [0035])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the electronic display suspended above a dental chair, comprising a wireless communication device that transmits input instructions for the display of content on the electronic display, as taught by Parsons, with the warning kit disclosed by Summers because it would enable the warning kit to enable a dental patient to select the content presented on the display.

Regarding claim 52, the above combination of Summers, Glen, and Parsons teaches the device according to claim 51, and the choice that the handling means and reception means comprise means for adjusting the transmission and reception frequency of the request signal would have been an obvious design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that does not produce any new or unexpected result.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant's arguments filed January 29, 2009, have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

The applicant traverses the rejection of claims 25 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Summers in view of Glen and further in view of Elden.

Against the rejection of claim 25, the applicant argues that in the invention recited in claim 25, when the patient operates the handling means, the interpreting means display to the patient himself, before emitting it, a warning that can be interpreted by the operator, but in contrast, when the client of Elden handles the transmitting means, a visual indicator is instantly displayed on the central station for interpretation of the operator, perhaps somewhere hidden to the client (see column 3, lines 62-65: "the central station may be located near the cashier's table or other location where the service personnel of the restaurant can see it frequently and conveniently"), and the audible annunciator is triggered only when the operator has taken an unduly long amount of time to respond to the client's request. The applicant argues that the client is not given an opportunity to review the communication before it is sent, and once the communication is sent, an audible annunciation is delayed. The applicant argues that Elden's teachings would not have led a person of ordinary skill in the field of this invention from Summers and Glen to the invention now recited in claim 25.

In making the foregoing argument, the applicant refers to page 11 of the first Office Action, and observes that on page 11, the Office Action finds that it would have

been obvious to apply the teachings of Elden in view of Summers and Glen in rejecting claim 26, which has now been cancelled. The applicant argues that claim 25 has been amended to include the limitations formerly contained in cancelled claim 26.

Regarding the argument against the rejection of claim 25, the amendment of claim 25 does not include limitations formerly contained in cancelled claim 26. The amendment language of claim 25 is different from, and broader than, the limitations formerly contained in cancelled claim 26. Because the amendment language of claim 25 is broader than the limitations formerly contained in cancelled claim 26, Summers discloses the limitations recited by the amendment of claim 25, so Elden is not cited in the rejection of claim 25 stated above. Because the rejection of claim 25 stated above does not cite Elden, the applicant's arguments about whether Elden teaches means for displaying a visual indication that can be seen by the client are irrelevant.

Against the rejection of claim 49, the applicant argues that in a preferred embodiment (claim 49), the request signal is pre-selected by and first displayed to the patient on a screen 22 and, after confirmation by the patient, a sound signal is discharged for interpretation by the operator. The applicant argues that Elden does not allow the customer to select from several possible requests, and therefore does not provide the customer an opportunity to review the request signal before it is sent. The applicant argues that claim 49 and the claims which depend from it are therefore deemed allowable even if claim 25 is not.

Regarding the argument against the rejection of claim 49, Elden is not cited in the rejection of either claim 49, or claim 25, from which claim 49 depends. Therefore,

the applicant's arguments about whether Elden teaches means for allowing the customer to select from several possible requests and whether Elden provides the customer an opportunity to review the request signal before it is sent are irrelevant.

For all the foregoing reasons, the applicant's arguments are not persuasive, and the claims are rejected, as stated above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN F. MORTELL whose telephone number is (571)270-1873. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571)272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JM/

/Daniel Wu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612